

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	Case No. 4:07CR00337 CEJ (AGF)
LINDA WROBLEWSKI,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**ORDER ON PRETRIAL MOTIONS**


This matter is before the Court on the pretrial motion filed by the government. Pretrial matters were referred to the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The government filed a motion for an order directing pretrial production of records. (Doc. No. 18). Defendant filed a notice that she wished to waive her right to file pretrial motions (Doc. No. 17), and a response stating that she had no objections to the government's motion. (Doc. No. 19).

This matter came before the Court for a hearing on pretrial motions on **Wednesday, August 2, 2007, at 1:00 p.m.** The government was represented by Assistant United States Attorney James Crow and Defendant was represented by her attorney, Assistant Federal Public Defender Michael Dwyer. Defendant, who lives outside this district, appeared by telephone. After being advised of the right to file motions and to have an evidentiary hearing, Defendant knowingly and voluntarily waived her right to file or proceed on pretrial motions and to an evidentiary hearing.

In its own motion, the government requests the production, pursuant to Rule 17(c)(1) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, of certain documents from an attorney consulted by Defendant in connection with the alleged scheme to defraud. The attorney declined to produce the requested documents based on the attorney-client privilege. The government asserts that the production should be ordered under the crime-fraud exception. As set forth above, Defendant filed a response stating that she had no objection to the government's motion. At the hearing, after acknowledging that she would effectively be waiving any attorney-client privilege that attached to the documents, and that the Court would be ordering a production of the documents based upon her response, Defendant confirmed that she had no objections to the government's motion.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Motion of the United States for Order Directing Pretrial Production of Records (Doc. No. 18) is **GRANTED**.

  
AUDREY G. FLEISSIG  
United States Magistrate Judge

Dated this 3rd day of August, 2007.